

The Sun

SATURDAY, APRIL 18, 1896.

Subscription by Mail Post-Paid.
 DAILY, Per Month..... \$2.00
 DAILY, Per Year..... 24.00
 SUNDAY, Per Year..... 6.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year..... 30.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month..... 2.50
 Postage to Foreign Countries added.
 THE SUN, New York City.

Local News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Press and the Associated Press have been established at 21 to 23 Nassau street. All information and documents for publication are hereby disseminated to the press of the whole country.

Fitzhugh Lee for Havana.

As Consul-General at Havana, Gen. FITZHUGH LEE is probably quite competent to fill the place occupied for many years by that experienced officer, genuine American, and efficient public servant, the Hon. RAMON O. WILLIAMS. Gen. LEE has the political insight, the judgment, and the independence needed for the post.

But apparently there is something more than a Consul-Generalship involved. It has been reported from Washington that Mr. CLEVELAND and Mr. OLNEY summoned Gen. LEE from Richmond and labored with him long before he consented to accept an appointment which has been regarded as somewhat less desirable than one of the first-class diplomatic missions. It has been represented to the stalwart Virginian, according to the story, that the Havana consulate is now the most important station in our whole foreign service, and that his functions there will be extraordinary.

If this means that Gen. LEE is expected to become while in Cuba more or less paramount as the representative of the Administration's policy, we pity the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. The experience of poor BLOUNT of Georgia ought to be a warning to any person who aspires to paramountcy. Mr. Secretary OLNEY, Gen. LEE might be able to get along comfortably; but OLNEY is not to be his principal.

A gentleman and a soldier like FITZHUGH LEE might be well fitted for a Consul-General and yet make a miserable Paramount.

New Jersey Leading Maine.

The New Jersey Republican platform, so enthusiastically adopted at Trenton, contains this plank, very interesting as coming from New Jersey:

"We have always given protection to our shipbuilders. In late years we have neglected to protect our shipbuilders. We believe the time has come to return to the policy of Washington and Hamilton, which by discriminating duties on foreign bottoms, secured 90 per cent. of our carrying trade to American ships, and which, if now restored, would again revive our shipping and cause American freights to be paid to American citizens."

This is repeated literally from one of the resolutions of the platform of the Massachusetts Republicans.

What is even yet more interesting is the circumstance that the Maine Republicans, who held their State Convention on the same day as their New Jersey brethren, and adopted a platform written or revised by the Hon. THOMAS BRACKETT REED, and stating authoritatively his views on a variety of subjects, omitted altogether the demand for discriminating duties in favor of American ships. Now, Maine is the State, perhaps, most directly interested in legislation designed to revive the ocean commerce of this country. It is from that quarter, if from anywhere, that we should expect to hear the loudest voice for discriminating duties favoring freights carried in American bottoms.

This was not an oversight on the part of the Portland Convention. Mr. JOHN O. PATTEN of Bath, a gentleman deeply interested in all that concerns American shipping, made a gallant but unavailing attempt to introduce a resolution identical with or equivalent to that which at the very same hour the Republicans at Trenton were adopting. Mr. PATTEN could not get it. Apparently it was not regarded as part of Mr. REED's programme, or was regarded as a reflection upon him.

There must be some other explanation of this curious incident. Is the Speaker less solicitous for the welfare of American shipping than WILLIAM J. FENWELL of Camden or GARRET A. HOBART of Passaic?

The Socialists in 1896.

While the Democrats have selected Chicago as their Convention city this year, the Republicans St. Louis, and the Prohibitionists Pittsburg, the Socialists with sinister intentions, perhaps, have chosen New York City as the place, and the Fourth of July as the date of their National Convention this year to put in the field candidates for President and Vice-President.

The Socialist party as a group of agitators, seeking the amelioration of existing conditions by independent, and therefore impotent political action, was established in New York in 1877. It was not until ten years later that the Socialists took upon themselves a formal organization on the American plan, meeting in State Convention in this city on the 25th of September, 1887, and adopting a statement of principles which was nearly as long as the speech in Congress on the seed question, and about as definite and comprehensible to voters not well versed in the familiar phrases of what is called the Socialist propaganda. The Socialist party embarked as a national organization in the Presidential contest of 1888 by a somewhat whimsical method. The Socialists nominated electors in this State, but they did not choose any Presidential candidates for whom these electors were to vote. In other words, those who supported the Socialist ticket voted for Presidential electors, but not for any Presidential candidate, and there were found by official count in this State 5,000 electors, a larger number than had determined the result of the previous Presidential contest, who supported these Socialist electors nominated under the plan which we have stated.

In 1892, however, the Socialist party, which in the meanwhile had been gaining some recruits, came forward with a Presidential nominee named SIMON WING, a Massachusetts tailor. CHARLES H. MATTRETT of New York, a resident of the city of Brooklyn and the Socialist candidate for Governor of New York in 1894, was the Socialist candidate for Vice-President in 1892. This ticket, nominated in the regular way by convention, was supported in five States only; for the reason that the Socialists in the other States who in 1888 had electors, but no Presidential candidate, had in 1892 a Presidential candidate, but no electors; a complication which, it seems reasonable to conclude, would never happen to an organization composed wholly or chiefly of free-born American citizens conducting political business in the English language.

The Socialist party, which had polled 2,000 votes in 1888, polled 21,164 votes in 1892. The much larger number belonged to New York, but 1,887 belonged to New Jersey, 898 to Pennsylvania, 649 to Massachusetts, and 249 to Connecticut. Since that time the Socialist party has gained what it has in the Eastern States, but in many Western States where it might be supposed that by reason of the conglomerate foreign population the Socialists would not lack recruits, their forces have been diverted to the Populist column. This is the case especially in Chicago, Cleveland, and Cincinnati. In the last State election in Massachusetts, where, oddly enough, the Socialists have been gaining rapidly, they secured for their candidate for Governor 3,249 votes. In Rhode Island their record in the same year was 1,780, in Connecticut at the last State election 849, in Ohio 1,807, in Missouri 1,572, in New Jersey 4,147, in New York 31,497 (more than the Socialist party polled in the States in 1892), and in Pennsylvania 1,305.

There are probably in the United States to-day 100,000 Socialist voters. Judging by the growth of the Socialist party during the past four years, a total of 100,000 Socialist voters in all the States of the country in which Socialist electoral tickets are run this year, is probably not an extravagant estimate. It is the stated intention of the leaders of the Socialist party to make this year a fight not only in those States in which they have an organized following, but also in California, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois. The Populists cast considerably more votes in the State of 1892 one million votes without affecting the result, and a total of 100,000 for the Socialists, therefore, is not likely to be disquieting to the politicians of either party. But the separation of the Socialist voters from the old parties in the Eastern States has had one visible and remarkable effect: it has greatly diminished the influence of the German-American voters, so-called, from whose ranks the Socialists recruit most largely drawn. These Socialists are, to a man, so their leaders declare, "for personal liberty" in beer drinking, and they are represented as somewhat bitterly resenting the adoption of the liquor legislation which is designed to restrict the enforcement of the laws against beer drinking on Sundays.

If, however, the Socialists, who are to meet in this city in national Convention on July 4, adhere to their proclaimed programme of independent action, they will withdraw a considerable number of votes from their natural allies in the battle against restrictive rural regulations, and thereby unwittingly assist the Republicans.

Thirty-knot Torpedo Boats.

The offer of the HENRICHSSONs to build for the Government 225-ton torpedo boats to hold for a guaranteed speed of 30 knots, tends to insure such craft for our navy.

The current House provision for torpedo boats authorizes five of 20 knots, to cost in the aggregate not over \$275,000. The Senate committee has substituted three 30-knot boats, to cost not over \$800,000, and the offer of the HENRICHSSONs shows that this allows margin enough. It is not clear why this firm did not await the bidding before naming its exact price, but the practical result is that Congress gets information enough for deciding what sort of torpedo boats to call for.

The type thus contemplated is, of course, the torpedo-boat catcher or torpedo-boat destroyer, which has been the sensation of late years in England from its phenomenal bursts of speed. Starting with 47 knots, the speed of these boats has steadily been carried to and beyond the 30-knot mark which we are next to aim at, and in the case of the Desperate, beyond 31 knots. France is doing her part well, with boats like the Forban, and, in short, if we mean to keep up with the procession, we can hardly do less than adopt 30 knots as our maximum for a few of the next group.

Of course, these high speeds have only been made practicable by increasing the size and cost of torpedo boats. Our first craft, the Cushing, with a speed officially put at 25½ knots, had only 105 tons displacement, and her contract price for hull and machinery was but \$28,750. The Ericsson followed, with 24 knots required, on an allowance of 120 tons displacement and a cost of \$113,500. The three now building by the Columbian Iron Works increased the contract speed to 24½ knots, with 142 tons displacement, and yet at a contract price of only \$37,500. The Seattle boat guarantees 26 knots, we believe, on 182 tons, for \$160,000, while the speed expected of the two HENRICHSSON boats, provided for in the same act, is 27½ knots, at a cost of \$14,000 each.

Altogether, if the Senate and the House agree upon the right form of authorization, we may have 30-knot torpedo boats in our navy about the end of next year.

Rules of the Road at Sea.

When the bill to authorize the reconvening of the American delegates to the International Maritime Conference of 1889 came before Congress, it was explained that there was a hope that by March or April the British Government would decide what to do about the proposed new rules to prevent collisions at sea.

The time thus indicated is passing away, and as yet there is no sign that England has taken any further steps in the matter. The new regulations were adopted seven years ago, at Washington, in a conference that represented a vast majority of the world's shipping. The next year Congress arranged to carry them into effect at any time that might be agreed upon. Two years ago England notified our Government that she considered March 1, 1895, as a proper date for this purpose, and urged the United States and other countries to concur. Accordingly, in July, 1894, President CLEVELAND issued his proclamation, fixing upon that date for the change, as the act of Congress had empowered him to do.

Fully six months later, in January, 1895, the British Government informed our own that it could not accept the date which it had thus selected and urged, because Parliament had not expressed its wish on the subject. Of course it would have been criminal to expose navigation to the risks of having two rules of the road prevailing, and our Government was forced to concur in the requested postponement. It further agreed at that time that France and Belgium had previously been notified in the same way by England, and had withdrawn the orders they had issued to change to the new rules. Only six weeks then remained to us for the purpose, but an act of Congress was passed in February, and a new proclamation by the President withdrawing the old one was sent out in all directions. Fortunately, the telegraph goes to all parts of the earth, and no mischief resulted from the bungling arrangements.

During the last twelve months and more our Government has been waiting to hear what the British Parliament should decide upon in the matter. When the act of Feb.

25, 1895, was passed, the dilatory and shifting conduct of Great Britain was indignantly denounced in the Senate. But that expression of opinion seems not to have hurried JOHN BULL at all. This year, accordingly, Congress has supplemented its former action by providing that the delegates who represented us in the conference of 1889 may get together and see what should be done about any changes the British Parliament may recommend in the proposed new rules.

It does not appear that our Government has ever taken ground against the validity of the objections raised by Liverpool steamship owners and others in regard to the system of sound signals in fog which the Washington conference recommended. The main objection has been to the British method of managing this affair, selecting a day for putting the new rules into effect, officially notifying us that it had given sufficiently "careful consideration" to the new rules, and that "no time should be lost in putting them into operation," and then, when we had accepted its views, notifying us again that everything must be recalled and postponed, and that Parliament had come to no decision. It would seem, however, that, under the current action of Congress, we shall be prepared for the next step, whether England concludes to accept, to reject, or to modify the proposed regulations, and we have only to wait until she gets ready to attend to the matter.

How to Stifle Jingoism in Canada.

Although the people of Great Britain and Ireland have had the good sense to recognize that Mr. CLEVELAND was right in thinking that the whole Venezuelan boundary question ought to be referred to arbitration, the Canadian Tories are still exuberant and rampant in their protestations of loyalty and protest to be spilling for a fight. There is much flag waving, much drum beating, much celebration of trivial successes in the war of 1812, much preaching of victories to come, and especially much jubilation over the defenceless condition of American cities on the lakes.

It is true enough that in one particular the Canadian Jingoism would have us at a disadvantage in the event of war. Except Toronto, there is no large city upon the Canadian side of the chain of inland seas. It is far otherwise with the American side, on which are to be found not only one of the greatest cities of the world, Chicago, but also such large centres of urban population as Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, and Duluth. From this point of view the situation is entirely changed from what it was when the United States and Great Britain agreed that neither country should keep a large naval force on the great lakes. When that agreement was made, neither of the parties had any large lakeside cities to defend; the one had about as much at stake as the other. Now, on the other hand, the Canadian Jingoism can argue with much plausibility that in a war with the Americans they could inflict incomparably more damage than they would receive. It is no doubt, true that five American cities on the inland seas contain more destructible wealth than the whole Dominion.

If the conditions were reversed, and the great centres of urban population were on the Canadian side of the lakes, it is certain that England would long since have given notice of a rescission of the agreement which forbade her from maintaining a naval force adequate for the defence of the vast interests that would be imperilled in the event of war. She would no more hesitate to do this than she has hesitated to construct fortresses at Halifax and Esquimaux, fortresses which would have no reason for existence unless the possibility of a contest with the United States were contemplated. Why should we delay to offer the protection which such cities as Chicago, Buffalo, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and Duluth have a right to demand? For their sakes and our own we ought to announce our determination to abrogate the one-sided compact which prevents us from creating a navy on our inland seas.

There must be some other explanation of this curious incident. Is the Speaker less solicitous for the welfare of American shipping than WILLIAM J. FENWELL of Camden or GARRET A. HOBART of Passaic?

The time thus indicated is passing away, and as yet there is no sign that England has taken any further steps in the matter. The new regulations were adopted seven years ago, at Washington, in a conference that represented a vast majority of the world's shipping. The next year Congress arranged to carry them into effect at any time that might be agreed upon. Two years ago England notified our Government that she considered March 1, 1895, as a proper date for this purpose, and urged the United States and other countries to concur. Accordingly, in July, 1894, President CLEVELAND issued his proclamation, fixing upon that date for the change, as the act of Congress had empowered him to do.

Fully six months later, in January, 1895, the British Government informed our own that it could not accept the date which it had thus selected and urged, because Parliament had not expressed its wish on the subject. Of course it would have been criminal to expose navigation to the risks of having two rules of the road prevailing, and our Government was forced to concur in the requested postponement. It further agreed at that time that France and Belgium had previously been notified in the same way by England, and had withdrawn the orders they had issued to change to the new rules. Only six weeks then remained to us for the purpose, but an act of Congress was passed in February, and a new proclamation by the President withdrawing the old one was sent out in all directions. Fortunately, the telegraph goes to all parts of the earth, and no mischief resulted from the bungling arrangements.

During the last twelve months and more our Government has been waiting to hear what the British Parliament should decide upon in the matter. When the act of Feb.

A Boastful Warrior.

The present head of the Salvation Army in this country is "Commissioner" BOOTH-TUCKER, the husband of one of "General" BOOTH's daughters. Before coming here he had served in the same capacity in India, where he was noted for the fertility of his imagination in reporting and describing his spiritual exploits. A picture of him arrayed in the native Indian costume, with the Salvation Army label around his turban, makes him look the theatrical character which he seems to be in reality.

The Independent of last week refers to recent assertions by the "Commissioner" as to the great strength and wonderful achievements of the Salvation Army in India, and then proceeds to refute them by presenting evidence furnished by Bombay and Calcutta papers and Christian missionaries long established in India. For instance, the Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, a Presbyterian missionary, says that, in a populous district with which he is familiar, this boasted strength is almost wholly on paper only. BOOTH-TUCKER

enumerated many corps "in places where the Army has not got a single individual that is in any connection with it." Mr. GILLESPIE makes other denials of the stories of the "Commissioner," and all of them are specific. He shows that the reports of great successes are usually without any foundation in fact, and always are grossly exaggerated. The Bombay Guardian, a paper which is not at all unfriendly to the Army, confirms the statements of the missionary, and advises that there should be "a careful inquiry into the condition of the Army's work by independent Christian men." The Indian Witness, a Calcutta paper published under the authority of the Methodist mission, presents evidence to show that "General" Booth's philanthropic side is not adapted to the political conditions of India, and is utterly visionary and impracticable. It says that "those who may become the recipients of help in the way proposed by 'General' BOOTH are more likely to be hurt than helped by his interference," and it speaks from long and extensive knowledge of the very sort of people among whom the Salvation Army expends its sensational efforts. It points out, also, that he has no understanding of the genius of the country; and that a deficiency which the old man has displayed very conspicuously elsewhere, is not generally.

Soon after the theatrical BOOTH-TUCKER arrived in New York he had the impudence to declare in a publication that in the short space of fourteen years only he had "placed Christianity in India on a different footing." Then he proceeded to reel off statistics of alleged Salvation Army officers and corps in India as proof of his wonderful prowess and tactical genius as a religious warrior. It seems that he is noted for that sort of thing in that far-away country. For instance, when he boasted that he had ten thousand soldiers in Gujarat he did not dare to take up an offer of a rupee a head if he could produce one hundred real converts. The magnifying power of the "Commissioner's" imagination seems to be marvellous; but it is not unlikely that he will make the use of its full limit in order to make the result of his operations in America seem more than insignificant, if not absolutely contemptible.

The "General" should have left his prodigious son-in-law in India instead of ordering him to New York, where cranky and disordered people of his sort are not likely to be held in high esteem and taken in sober earnest. We don't want a fellow from England, by way of India, to put our Christianity "on a different footing."

The East African Dwarfs.

Dr. A. DONALDSON SMITH of Philadelphia told the large audience of the American Geographical Society at Chickering Hall on last Monday, of his sixteen months' journey in 1894-95 among the Somalis and Gallas from the Gulf of Aden southwestward to the salt lakes of Stefanie and Rudolf near the eastern limits of the Upper Nile basin. Dr. SMITH's route passed for hundreds of miles through the country of Galla tribes, south of Abyssinia, whom no explorer had ever visited before. He therefore brings to us the first definite idea we have received of a large region, and among the many specimens of fauna he has brought home, twenty-four species are new to science. We believe that in another respect his observations are of more than ordinary interest.

Dr. SMITH spoke of his visit to a dwarf tribe, some scores of miles north of Lake Rudolf, but he did not say what he believes is a fact, that he is the first white man who has seen these little people in their homes, though there has been evidence of their existence.

Less than four years ago Dr. HENRY SCHLICHTER of the British Museum collected all the reports about East African dwarfs with a view to answering, if possible, the vexed question: "Do pygmies still exist in East Africa, and if so, where?" Summarizing all the reports, he found that as far back as 1826 Capt. BOTLEKER had brought information about the East African dwarfs; that when travelling in Abyssinia, Shoa, and Kaffa, Messrs. HARRIS, KRAFF, D'ABADIE, HARTMANN, and several others had heard much of the existence of pygmies in the unexplored country just a little south; and that AVASTIERES, KRAFF, and D'ABADIE saw traces of these dwarfs, though not in their native habitat.

All the evidence collected by Dr. SCHLICHTER seemed to point conclusively to the existence of dwarf tribes near the southern border of Kaffa, the southernmost part of Abyssinia, and the neighboring region of the thirty-third meridian east of Greenwich. When Count TELEKI discovered Lake Rudolf he did not travel north of the lake far enough to meet the dwarfs. But Dr. SMITH has done so, has seen the dwarfs, or at least one tribe of them, in their home, and has justified Dr. SCHLICHTER's division of the pygmy tribes into the East African, Central African, West African, and South African dwarfs. Dr. SMITH's brief description of those he saw confirms the previous evidence that the East African dwarfs, in size, appearance, and habits, are similar to those of the Upper Nile and Congo.

STEAM has come muscle when it comes to endurance, but that fact sometimes eclipses both was shown on the Boulevard last Thursday. A wheelman who was mounted on a bicycle provided with a gasoline engine, set out to distance everybody in sight by scorching wildly in defiance of the law and the police. The crowd, however, not suspecting his means of locomotion, each took a turn at chasing him, and each in turn was left behind. Matters changed, however, later on, when one of the officers, who had discovered the fugitive's route, came upon him and took him prisoner.

From the first appearance of mounted policemen in this city it seems to have been the determination of a good many scorchers to defy the cycling bluecoats; though rarely, if ever, has one of these reckless challengers escaped an overwhelming finality, and a sharp lecture or a fine in court. The case in point should impress every lawless wheelman with the fact that, while superior racing ability is usually a safe guarantee of his capture, it is possible for some officers to use strategy, when necessary.

Several hundred of the brightest and best educated young colored people of the South met at Atlanta in December last for the purpose of discussing and what was done during the three days they were together is told in a volume of 240 pages that has been sent to THE SUN. Those meetings, conducted by the doors by many hundreds of the town folk, had been called to consider the colored people's position in the South, and to help the continent from which his fathers came. There were white men and women at that Congress on Africa who were specially qualified to give value to its deliberations; but the colored element contributed equally able and well-informed speakers, and an audience was remarkable, as they ought to have been, for they included hundreds of the best graduates and students of the higher schools for the negro in every Southern State—the earnest and enlightened young men and women who are continually going out to labor for the elevation of the masses of their race among us.

We have never read a paper on missionary work in Africa containing more sound, practical advice or expressed in better English than that of the great disfranchisement of the philosopher.

that Miss M. FARRER read at this Congress, and he was born in Boston, and he is a credit to his race. No one who attended those meetings will regard it as an inviolable to say that one of the most scholarly and by far the most eloquent address delivered was that of Prof. J. W. E. HOWES, Ph.D., D.D., a man whose career shows what the Afro-American of brains and ambition can achieve.

The outcome of these meetings was that the Afro-Americans of the South have decided that they shall have a share in the work of educating and reclaiming the native African. The initial movement to this end, already well under way, is centered in the "Missionary Foundation for Africa," established at Atlanta through the munificence of a wealthy Illinoisian, the Rev. W. T. STEWART, and the movement is thriving under the leadership of the Rev. W. P. THURGOOD, D.D., and his co-workers in the cause of Afro-American education.

For a bank officer or bank stockholder to tell the truth about the legal tender notes seems to be impossible. Here is what Mr. JACOB L. GREENE said to the Hartford Board of Trade on March 23 last:

"For with a continuance of existing conditions we shall have a horrid enough prospect to say the least. I have actually sold, our entire greenback stock, and it will not be a dollar less, on Dec. 1, 1895, we had already paid out for \$27,000,000 of our greenbacks, and yet every dollar of the Government is outstanding. The appetite of OLIVER TAFT was not harder to satisfy."

Mr. GREENE must be a poor sort of an accountant not to perceive that if we have, as he says, "actually sold our entire greenback stock," it cannot still be outstanding. As a matter of fact, a large part of it is outstanding, and therefore it cannot have been paid. Or does Mr. GREENE think that after the outstanding notes were paid they were given away to favored persons, and thus kept out without any value having been received for them?

It has been remarked, in connection with the Senate committee's striking from the House Navy bill of the provision for additional mares, that Secretary HENRIKER did not call for them in his annual report.

That is true, but it should be said that at that time the agencies which have to do with the matter had not arisen. The Secretary asked, in that report, for only two battle ships and twelve torpedo boats; and yet beyond question he is delighted with the authorization of four such ships and fifteen such boats actually made in the House bill. In the manner, he probably thought last November that the 1,000 additional men for the navy were all he could expect; but, as a fact, he afterward wrote a special letter to the House Naval Committee, urgently requesting an increase, also, of the Marine Corps.

The addition of 500 men proposed for the latter by the House bill is directly in line with the policy of strengthening the personnel of the navy which the building of many new ships imposes.

"MADE-TO-ORDER GENERALS."

A Protest from a National Guardsman Against the House Officers.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Your article entitled "Made-to-order Generals" was interesting. I hope that the suggestion that Messrs. Higgins, Mullins, and Kenyon be called to account for their insult to the National Guard may be taken up by some one in Buffalo, where these persons violated the provisions of the Military Code.

Those seem to be the only persons whom the law can reach. But the guilty persons are the paymaster, Major-General, and Colonels of the Governor's staff, who with utter lack of respect for the National Guard, and with knowledge of what it means, let these officers wear it. If these officers could be court-martialed for "conduct unbecomingly an officer," they would respect the respect for the uniform which the real National Guardsman is proud to assume. The National Guard is a body of men, and when Josiah Porter was Adjutant-General, Respectfully,
 A GUARDSMAN.

OUR THREE GREAT APRIL WARS.

A Remarkable Group of Anniversaries.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Yesterday, Sunday, and last Sunday present a group of anniversaries which are remarkable for the proximity to the calendar and thus on the calendar of history. Each is the anniversary of the first overt act of armed hostility of a great war.

On April 10, 1757, the French captured from the English the fort of the Allegheny and Monongahela rivers, subsequently named Fort Duquesne. That was the opening scene of the French and Indian war, which settled the question of Latin American domination on this continent.

On April 19, 1775, the first gun was fired in the conflict that determined which branch of the Anglo-Saxon race should control this country. The British shot the first shot at Sumner, and the great civil war, which has cemented the nation together forever in the bond of unity. Each of these three wars seems to have been an incident in the progress toward our national destiny, a necessary stage of our political evolution, and to have been consecutive in the accomplishment of a definite division of our national history. In each of these wars the side which initiated the hostilities on date mentioned suffered final defeat. That these three anniversaries should fall within a week of each other in the calendar is but interesting as a coincidence, and calculated to stir up a train of instructive thought in the patriotic mind.

NEW YORK, April 17. EDWARD HADAMAN HALL.

Grammar and Religious Journalism.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The following sentence appears in an editorial article in one of this week's religious papers:

"Away with those Americans who are so ungrateful to thank the Berlin or Paris or Birmingham are better governed than New York, Boston, or Chicago are, or have been in the recent past."

The Sun, which ought to be read by every good American, is so an authority on grammatical questions, and therefore I ask you if the sentence quoted above violates any of the rules of good grammar?
 NEW YORK, April 16. PATRICK JONES.

Violates? It annihilates.

Golf in Kaffraria.

From the St. James's Gazette.
 An intelligent English has been told to define himself, which two men arrived with him, and he, who had been a player since "old" and "new" "Hard Lines" Golf, according to the "Herald" Magazine, seems to have similarly imitated the "Herald" Magazine. A Kaffir warrior was observed attentively watching the efforts of certain unskillful players to extract their ball from one of those deep bunkers which are a source of trouble to the player. He was asked to be a ball-thrower, a great ball-thrower, with a huge pole, shouting "Goddam!" the while. "This white man's game," said the dusky child of nature; "they call it golf, while mine is 'gamm'."

A Jubilate.

At early morn, or when the day is done,
 The paper to read is THE NEW YORK SUN.
 It gives the news of the world, and takes the bun-
 On all vital questions that belong to today.
 It is right side up, and it's there to stay.
 Without fear it flashes its double X-ray,
 And in progress it holds "the right of way."
 Its rapier is keen for a fraud or a fake;
 It traces up "New Journalism" in a roach or a bake,
 It is honest and straight, for honesty's sake,
 And whatever the "row" it is in the stake.

It wastes no time in lying, but goes for the truth;
 Its satire is sharp as a serpent's tooth;
 It endures the courage of Hamilton Booth,
 And with him new friends from old age to youth.
 It polishes the "General" in a way that is fine,
 And it takes him with a touch quite divine;
 We feel it is timely to get into him,
 A new "Independence" declaration to sign.

Ahead and at home let the tidings be told,
 The Sun's great convictions are not bought or sold;
 Its record is unimpaired, consistent, and bold,
 "Amen for America," to have and to hold.
 Mrs. HARRY J. SHALLEN, 65 Cooper street, Brooklyn.

A lecture on John Sterling, with extracts from a correspondence between him and Ralph Waldo Emerson, is to be delivered by Dr. Edward G. Loring, the son of the famous Unitarian, at a hall, in this city, on Monday evening next. Mr. Sterling's name and his literary production may not be well known to the general public, but he is a devoted man, and he wrote the first of his biographies, which died in 1844. Archdeacon Hare has performed that task to the great dissatisfaction of the philosopher.

IS DEMOCRACY TO DESTROY?

The Political Apostasy and Insanity of a Few New York Democrats.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I spent the other evening in the company of several New York Democrats. They are men of financial power, more than of political importance, but they are not without influence in the councils of the Cleveland faction of the party. When the question of the Democratic nomination for President was introduced, I found that they all agreed in their preference for Mr. Cleveland. They advocated his nomination on the old ground that he is a platform in himself, and that accordingly, with him as the candidate, the sort of platform adopted by the Chicago Convention would be a matter of no consequence. When I ventured the suggestion that such nomination would be politically dangerous, they replied that the prejudices against a third term for a President was almost wholly superstitious; and that, even if it were reasonable ordinary circumstances, it ought to be overcome by the necessities of the present extraordinary situation. Of course, they meant that, however dangerous the election of a third term President might be, they had rather risk the experiment than incur the danger of free coinage; and by putting Cleveland again in the White House they expected to circumvent the silver Democrats.

After hearing such talk, I am not surprised at the contemptuous tone of so large a part of Southern and Western Democrats toward the New York banker, as a man who is ready to sacrifice every political principle in a frantic effort to save his money-bags. These are the men whom I have spoken were willing to subvert and pervert our whole political system to prevent a consequence which is not probable, and which can be avoided by means that do not involve any such catastrophe. I suggested that if we were to "invest" about the free coinage, because it might cause business disturbance, the same argument would be used as a pretext for doing away with Presidential elections altogether; but one of the third terms answered that such a prospect was not disagreeable so far as himself was concerned, and evidently the rest were not at all alarmed at it.

In other words, these bankers, calling themselves Democrats, are willing to destroy the Democratic party and overthrow democratic principles in a crazy attempt to ward off the possibility of financial disaster. They would send the country from financial ruin, they would send it down to political ruin, from which financial paralysis would be sure to result. All such false Democrats and recreant Americans are infinitely more dangerous to sound finance than the wild silver fanatics. They would betray the republic, upon which depends its soundness; and it is far more necessary for our political health that they should be defeated and circumvented. They are traitors to Democratic principle whose overt acts are the destruction of the party for the salvation of the Democracy of the silver appetite is a surface and an ephemeral manifestation of political and financial delusion, but the grounds on which a third term for Cleveland are advocated are rotten and easily crumbled, but the other is virulent and absolutely fatal.

Practically, of course, the third-term proposition is downright political insanity. If the election of Cleveland were requisite to prevent the free coinage, as these moneybags declared the other evening, free coinage would be the result to endure; we should as wise men throw up the sponge at once and make the best we could of the calamity. Cleveland cannot be elected again. I do not believe that he could carry a single State, and doubt if he could get ahead in the electoral college.

If, then, the defeat of free coinage depends on his election, it is bound to be triumphant beyond the possibility of doubt. The difference in the Democratic party touching the currency is a healthy manifestation. The party would survive the triumph of either side; but the third-term proposition is absolutely poisonous. It is a proposition to kill the Democratic party in order to punish the silver people.

Cleveland cannot be nominated at Chicago. It would be a shame to Democracy if even the suggestion of his nomination were made. If the silver Democrats prevail in the Convention, the result will be unfortunate for the party. It will be beaten next November. But if the Democratic apostasy, of which these New York financiers are representatives, should win the day, the result would be